

2017 Development Plan and Gap Analysis Update

Public Engagement Summary to date

12/15/2016

Coordination with other City Departments, Commissions, and Citywide Public Meetings

Monthly	Coordination meetings with OPCD and DON
10/19/16	Citywide IDT Walkability and Open Space – SPR hosted, attendees include: OPCD, SDOT, SPU, OSE, DON
11/10/16	Briefing to Board of Park Commissioners with some Planning Commissioners and staff in attendance
12/3/16	Citywide Public Meeting – Bitter Lake
12/7/16	Citywide Public Meeting – West Seattle
12/8/16	Briefing to the Planning Commission
12/9/16	Open Space Focus Group – SPR hosted, attendees represented a variety of organizations and community groups, including: Seattle Parks Foundation, POSA, Groundswell NW, Forterra, Trust for Public Land, Seattle Green Spaces Coalition, Central Area and Lake City
12/13/16	Citywide Public Meeting – Ravenna

The following meetings have not occurred yet

1/10/17	Citywide Public Meeting – 1 st First Hill/Capitol Hill
2/4/17	Citywide Public Meeting – Columbia City

Citywide open house meetings:

Summary Bitter Lake

This venue was well attended, with approximately 100 people in attendance overall. We easily had 30-40 people stop by the 'Parks' tables.

Some people were frustrated with the Open House format and wanted a more traditional meeting with lots of opportunity to comment. Some opinions given felt that HALA was a sham. Others seemed to be very appreciative of the format and all the information available.

Overall, people seemed very pleased with the proposed walkability approach and taking into consideration factors such as density and poverty levels as a means to prioritize future long-term acquisition.

Some people were frustrated that we had not included a more in depth sidewalk analysis and felt that that was key. Several people wanted to know what this meant for their neighborhood – Bitter Lake, Crown Hill, West Seattle.

Comments Received include:

1. What do you think about SPR's suggested network approach, based upon walkability and access, compared with the older buffer approach for informing SPR's long-term acquisition strategies?
 - *"This City is not safe, white lives matter, what is the City doing about this? People are not going to walk to parks at night without sidewalks."*
 - *Open space options that increase accessibility for low income should be considered as long as mechanisms are in place to prevent squatting.*
 - *I think it makes sense to consider walkability and access, however most Seattleites are within a half mile of a park or greenspace. You can bike, bus or drive to most sports. I prefer waking. Sometimes I do a "bus" hike.*
 - *There is not walkability without sidewalks and Urban Villages are defined by 10-minute walk zone, therefore, without sidewalks there can be no urban villages. All urban villages north of 85th require 100% sidewalks. NE Seattle has a parks deficit that's not showing in the gap analysis.*
 - *Lake City's low-income seniors, youth and immigrants urgently need a fully programmed community center.*
2. The Gap Analysis considers population density, levels of income, as well as other publically accessible land, such as Major Institutions and Universities, Seattle Public School property and Port property. Are there other factors that should be taken into consideration?
 - *I think those are factors to be Considered (levels of income, population density) however, parks are for everyone and should be close to all. I do think some areas need to be "saved" before development.*

3. What should the priority strategies be for Long-Term Acquisition, given the constraints of the built environment in a growing city?
 - *Maybe “new construction” should also help pay for parks and recreation like it does for housing, at least in the more urban areas this could be legislated.*

Summary West Seattle

Shelby's Creamery -

This venue was very well attended, very crowded and very noisy – at least 150 people were in attendance at this venue. Many folks were upset/angry with the venue choice, that food was served (many people felt that they were being ‘bought off’), that there was no opportunity for meaningful comment, and angry at HALA/DON’s approach overall.

We easily had 60-70 people come by the ‘Parks’ tables.

The majority of people were very appreciative of the effort, of the new mapping approach and thought that the walkability modeling was fantastic. Many people were super excited that they could access the data on their smartphones and tablets.

There were about 5 individuals who were upset that the West Seattle Golf Course was included as part of the parkland inventory; the feeling being that it was not open to the public since one needs to pay a fee to play golf.

One individual did not like our presentation boards – thought our color scheme was off (didn’t follow proper design principles), were difficult to understand, thought we should ‘fire’ our consultants and did not like the fact that we included the West Seattle Golf Course.

One individual thought that HALA was doing a disservice to “parks”, but did not elaborate.

Youngstown Cultural Center -

There were about 50 people at this venue and a few kids. It was a good space and it looked like folks had an opportunity to talk with a variety of department staff. SPR staff spoke with about 10 people and gave them background on the development plan and gap analysis; explained the change to the walkability metric and everyone was supportive of that approach.

There only real concern voiced by several people (2) was the gap in the Westwood Urban Village and the desire for more parks (and safer streets) in that neighborhood.

Written comments received to date include:

1. What do you think about SPR’s suggested network approach, based upon walkability and access, compared with the older buffer approach for informing SPR’s long-term acquisition strategies?
 - *You are to be congratulated on the impressive way to access so many layers of data!*

- *After talking with SPR staff this evening in West Seattle and looking at the map site, I support the idea of using funds to increase parks in areas where the gaps in urban villages coincide with high density and high poverty.*
- *Thank you for providing a positive and informative presentation at last night's open house meeting at Shelby's in West Seattle.*
- *The SPR displays and discussions were informative and helpful.*
- *I sincerely appreciate how the SPR team encouraged suggestions and feedback from all attendees, and then accepted it with patience and respect.*
- *I am very encouraged by the steps taken and the progress SPR has achieved on this project, and look forward to further updates.*
- *We have one park in the Junction which is amusing called a 'pocket' park, on Alaska and 42nd. Apparently we are supposed to consider the golf course on 35th as part of our green space as well as Lincoln Park. As much as my husband enjoys the golf course, which I know the city owns and which is obviously used only by golfers, and as much as we enjoy Lincoln Park, which is a bus ride away, there is really no other green space within the Junction. As it is, the pocket park is heavily used because there is nowhere else to sit (you can't really stroll through it as it takes less than one minute).*
- *With all the building of thousands of apartments in West Seattle, many of which are in the Junction, we need more green. Desperately. This should be obvious to anyone walking around here.*
- *The new plan should include a new park for the Junction. Or two. Please consider our neighborhood needs for a place to sit and breathe.*
- *Include SPU's substations as the utility sells them. Many are located in higher density neighborhoods that can use more green space.*
- *Love the idea of a bike/walking route around West Seattle (a complete loop), Alki to Lincoln Park to Meyers Way and back to Alki Someday!*
- *I live near the golf course and cannot use it because I don't golf. Please it should not count as a walkability "park" it's a golf course – common sense please.*
- *(Maps) look like a good start, I have to analyze it.*
- *Why are there no green spaces added to the Urban Villages?*
- *Create open space with High Rise Development not balconies or the building as open space. Publically accessible open space.*
- *Don't use Jefferson Golf course as a calculation for green space.*

- *Don't use H.S. stadium as green space.*
 - *Would suggest first concentrating on maintaining existing parks, and developing already acquired but not developed properties. If those are taken care of then sure, more greenspace is always better (bikeways are now a joke) but for God's sake keep the modeless out of the parks!*
 - *The Greenspace of HALA includes the West Seattle Golf Course. That is very misleading. Please don't try to add green space that isn't accessible. Redo maps to reflect reality!*
 - *Walkability is good! it's how people use parks and it cuts down on need to spend \$ on parking too.*
 - *There is a need for more benches to allow people to sit and rest.*
 - *We have one park in the Junction which is amusing called a 'pocket' park, on Alaska and 42nd. Apparently we are supposed to consider the golf course on 35th as part of our green space as well as Lincoln Park. As much as my husband enjoys the golf course, which I know the city owns and which is obviously used only by golfers, and as much as we enjoy Lincoln Park, which is a bus ride away, there is really no other green space within the Junction. As it is, the pocket park is heavily used because there is nowhere else to sit (you can't really stroll through it as it takes less than one minute).*
 - *With all the building of thousands of apartments in West Seattle, many of which are in the Junction, we need more green. Desperately. This should be obvious to anyone walking around here.*
 - *The new plan should include a new park for the Junction. Or two. Please consider our neighborhood needs for a place to sit and breathe.*
2. The Gap Analysis considers population density, levels of income, as well as other publically accessible land, such as Major Institutions and Universities, Seattle Public School property and Port property. Are there other factors that should be taken into consideration?
- *Urban villages underrepresented communities, historically investment, number of children, lack of open space around buildings, access to car, access to gardens, access to cheap healthful food (P-patch)*
 - *Lincoln Park and all parks need more open bathrooms in the winter. The Coleman Pool bathroom used to always be open all winter. I vote for parks levies hoping to get more all season restrooms so we don't have to pee in the bushes.*
 - *Bus lines. In gap areas, neighborhood, house, dense, pocket parks that get used, abandoned/unused alleys, church lots.*
 - *Pocket parks, under 10,000 square feet are needed so neighborhood children have a safe local park to play in.*

3. What should the priority strategies be for Long-Term Acquisition, given the constraints of the built environment in a growing city?
 - *Highland Park Urban Village Eastern Side. Meet the original plan. UV's encourage giving up cars, so make the residents of urban villages lives better. HALA = livability!*
 - *Think the Highline, green roofs, parks on top*
 - *SPD (SPR), needs to look at parks in other cities to see what they have achieved. Herman Park Houston TX. The walking paths in the Woodlands TX.*

Summary Ravenna

This venue was very well attended with approximately 100 people in attendance overall - people were engaged and generally very supportive. Several Planning Commissioners were in attendance, along with City Council staff.

We easily had 20-30 people come by the 'Parks' tables, posing questions and engaging in conversation.

The majority of people were very appreciative of the effort, really engaged with the new mapping approach and walkability modeling. The most common question/comment posed, was "how can we support you to get more open space and park facilities?"

As with the previous meetings, walking and sidewalk conditions were discussed along with a desire for transit routes to larger regional parks – especially where athletic fields exist. Additional comments and themes included:

- How and when a community center will be provided in Wallingford, especially due to renovation of Lincoln High School and expected residential growth as an urban village.
 - How and why Seattle Public Schools could mitigate open space for renovation of Lincoln High School by using the overcrowded Woodland Park athletic fields.
 - How to get a pathway developed from a community garden (within WSDOT ROW) at NE 60th Street and I-5 to Ravenna Boulevard.
 - What is status of park on Sisley property near Roosevelt High School.
1. What do you think about SPR's suggested network approach, based upon walkability and access, compared with the older buffer approach for informing SPR's long-term acquisition strategies?
 - *Walkability is a great concept for consideration for access to parks!*
 - *Walkability is more than calculated walking distance. Where are parks most needed by populations least able to walk long distances? Consider street conditions, lighting, size and accessibility of existing parks.*
 - *The network approach looks like it will really improve the ability to identify opportunities.*

- *Strong support!*
2. The Gap Analysis considers population density, levels of income, as well as other publically accessible land, such as Major Institutions and Universities, Seattle Public School property and Port property. Are there other factors that should be taken into consideration?
- *Consider neighborhood populations – are there senior housing locations or other circumstances that might change your definition of “walkability”?*
 - *I worry these factors blind the City to the facts on the ground. Students don’t visit parks too often; families with children visit parks a lot. Some areas have more families with cars, others fewer. Some improvements to existing parks are easy, others blocked by topology.*
 - *I’m excited that this new technology helps Parks do its job, but I worry about losing connection to the grounds themselves.*
 - *I know that many older residents will be opposed to this. I encourage everyone to fight for lighting on the Burke-Gilman Trail. This will be good for safety and improve the quality and comfort of all trail users. There are plenty of unlit green spaces in the city and more importantly outside of the urban-growth boundary. We need to accommodate higher density if we are going to lower our carbon footprint and not continue suburban sprawl. Lighting on the trail will help make Seattle more livable for the many who use it to walk and bicycle to get to work, school, shop and access transit.*
3. What should the priority strategies be for Long-Term Acquisition, given the constraints of the built environment in a growing city?
- *Non-driving populations, low-income communities, communities of color, where there are a few small parks only.*
 - *Areas far from parks; community spaces between buildings (not in parks).*

Additional Comments Received

- *I was surprised and alarmed to hear about a policy revision that threatened to undermine our efforts to achieve a neighborhood park in an area that has long been recognized by the City, and parks advocates, as Southeast Seattle’s “worst” gap in open space. This policy change if adopted would undermine the goals of equitable development and livable transit oriented communities.*

We respectfully ask that the City’s capital planning processes address the need to bridge Southeast Seattle’s worst gap in open space – before incentivized development makes that impossible.

In a recent meeting I was shown a new “gap map” for North Rainier which would blindly erase a known parks gap at North Rainier, based on a new theory that the Olmsted Boulevard System qualifies as usable open space. This new “go play in the Boulevard” approach is not a livable solution for future generations of our City, and would seem to be inconsistent with the GMA Board’s analysis. The City of Seattle has many potential tools in its toolbox to ensure breathability as its urban villages increase in density. However, if the City has not incentivized open space creation in zoning regulations, or imposed impact fees to bridge these gaps, then the only fallback is a capital plan that funds the acquisition outright. While Parks has begun an acquisition project for North Rainier’s existing gap – I understand that the Boulevard approach would destroy the driving force behind this acquisition project.

For the foregoing reasons I respectfully ask that the City’s 2017 Development Plan ensure that its formula is consistent with the analysis of the GMA Board.